

## REMARKS

In response to the claim objections set forth in paragraph 4 of the office action, the claims have been amended to remove the apparently confusing material.

Referring to the Section 112 rejection starting in paragraph 6(a), reconsideration is requested in view of the material in the specification at page 9, first line.

With respect to the objection to the material in 6(b), an appropriate amendment has been made to overcome the objection to claim 39.

With respect to the objection in 6(c) to claims 41 and 42, the objection has been overcome by suitable amendments.

With respect to the rejection of claims 33-35 and 39-41 based on Hind, claim 33 has been amended to call for having two portions of the same reprogrammable semiconductor memory. In contrast, in Hind, two separate memories are utilized, only one of which is reprogrammable. The need for two separate memories in Hind is disadvantageous and the ability to use one memory to do both things provides superior operational results.


Therefore, reconsideration is requested.

In paragraph 10, claims 1, 3, 5-7, 27, and 29 were, again, rejected over a combination which was previously the subject of an appeal. The appeal brief's pertinent sections is incorporated in response thereto.

Therefore, reconsideration is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 27, 2007



---

Timothy N. Trop, Reg. No. 28,994  
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.  
1616 South Voss Road, Suite 750  
Houston, TX 77057-2631  
713/468-8880 [Phone]  
713/468-8883 [Fax]

Attorneys for Intel Corporation